Infant-Baptiſm VINDICATED

FROM THE

EXCEPTIONS

OF

Mr. THOMAS GRANTHAM.

By *SAM. PETTO*,

Miniſter of the Goſpel in *SUDBURY*.

Acts 2. 39. *For the Promiſe is unto you, and to your Children.*

LONDON,

Printed by *T. S.* for *Ed. Giles*, Bookſeller in *Norwich*, and *T. Parkhurſt*, at the *Bible and Three Crowns* in *Cheapſide*, 1691.

TO THE

Christian Reader.

THere is such Scripture-Evidence for Infant-Baptism, that intelligent, unprejudiced Men may find what Mr. Grantham *saith against my Defence of it, a Reply, and no Answer; Presumption, and no Proof.*

The Practice of that Person which withdrew from our Communion, was such as (if admitted) is destructive to all Gospel or Church-Order, and so is no slight Occasion to write upon: But I had other weighty Matters ensuing, which necessitated my Writing; and Mr. Grantham *(not being medled with) can shew none such for his Replying.*

To the Reader.

As to what he ſaith to me, I ſhall very briefly anſwer, being ſtill of the ſame Mind that I was of. Let all be meaſured by the Rule of the Word: And that thou mayeſt have Underſtanding therein, ſhall be the Prayer of him, who is

Thine to ſerve thee

In the Goſpel,

Octob. 12. 1687. *Sam. Petto.*

Infant-

Infant-Baptiſm VINDICATED.

INfants were diverſified by the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. and ſo ſtill may be by the Will of Chriſt, all not being the Seed of *Abraham*.

My Argument, *pag.* 3. was *Ad Hominem*, as appears there, and by my Poſtſcript; and ſaith only, [*That Infant-Baptiſm is not expreſly forbidden, therefore either it is lawful, or elſe Scripture-Conſequences muſt be admitted,*] which is undeniable. It was occaſioned by my being told in a Conference, that there ſhould be expreſs Scripture in ſuch a Caſe; therefore it was not my Miſtake. Neither is my Argument anſwered by ſaying, as he doth, *p.* 2. [*There is no expreſs Scripture for Infant-Baptiſm, therefore Infant-Baptiſm may be omitted.*] This is falſe; for there is no expreſs Scripture for Women's Receiving the Lord's Supper, and divers other things, yet they may not be omitted, becauſe by Scripture-Conſequences, rightly deduced, they are required. And hence I can ſubſcribe to every Word which he mentions of that Author of our own, *p.* 2. and to *Tertullian*'s Rule; I am of the ſame Mind; there is nothing therein againſt my Argument, and I can eaſily withſtand any Innovation which is not expreſly forbidden in Scri-

ture; for *I think things may be commanded or forbidden by good Scripture-Consequence:* And it was and is my Judgment, *that all in the Worship of God must be commanded there, either expresly, or by necessary Consequence.*

Thus Mr. *Grantham*, at his first beginning with me, and frequently after, by a multitude of impertinent Words, would make his incautelous Reader believe, that I bring Scriptures for one purpose, which are brought for another. As, *p.* 4. I bring *Act.* 8. 3. and 9. 1. to prove that to be a Church-Member is, in Scripture, to be a Disciple; whereas he would have it believed, that I thereby would immediately prove Infants Disciples, *p.* 4. So the Scriptures by which I prove, *p.* 5. that the Name [*Holy*] is given to Father, Son and Spirit, as, 1 *Pet.* 1. 15. *Lev.* 19. 2. and 20. 7. *Heb.* 7. 26, *&c.* he, *p.* 5. 6, 7. would make the Reader believe, that I bring them immediately to prove Infants discipled. And the like use he maketh, *p.* 6, 7. of the Scriptures whereby I prove, *p.* 5. that the Name [*Holy*] is given to the Church and its Members. So that, either from great Ignorance or Inadvertency, he may blush that he beats the Air, and abuseth me.

As to my first Argument, *That some Infants are discipled so as to have the Name of Trinity upon them.*

At last, he denieth my Antecedent; saying, That no Infants are discipled at all, much less so as to have the Name of Father, Son and Spirit upon them.

In Answer, I evidenced it various ways: They are said to be [*holy,*] and so are discipled:

God

God hath put his Name upon them before their Baptiſm, though it is ſolemnly ſignalized and declared after, when they are baptized.

His firſt Reaſon, *p.* 3. *from* Act. 10. 28. *is anſwered in my Book*, p. 49, 50, 51. I grant there is no diſtinction between *Jew* and *Gentile*, but thoſe of both who are viſibly in Covenant (whether Adult, or Infants) are more clean than others who are out of Covenant; and are a holy People, differenced from others, *if not by Qualitative, yet by Relative Holineſs in Church-ſtate*, Rom. 11. 16. 1 Pet. 2. 9. as of old, and nothing here againſt it.

As to his ſecond Reaſon, I ſay, Men, by the Word of God, are to be inſtrumental to bring Men within the Covenant, which extendeth to their Seed; therefore alſo to make Infants Diſciples. Some may be made Diſciples without actual teaching, or learning; as we put Children to School, who at firſt learn nothing. Learned *Spanhemius* well obſerveth, τὸ μαθητεύειν, *non ſignificat ſolum docere, ſed Diſcipulos facere, & aquipollet*, τῷ μαθητὰς ποιεῖν, *Joh.* 4. 2. *Dub. Evang. Par.* 3. *p.* 93. giving Reaſons for it.

I do not ſay, that all who are under Means for Inſtruction (though Perſecutors) are Diſciples, but all who are in the School of Chriſt's Church; of which, ſome are Infants. The Infant-Seed of Believing *Jews* were in it (by Covenant, *Gen.* 17. and ſo, when that was ſpoken, *Matth.* 28. 19. (not being broken off till afterward;) and ſo alſo the Seed of Believing *Gentiles*.

I proved ſome Infants to be Diſciples, from *Act.* 15. 10. He denies that every one were Diſciples

ciples whom they would have circumciſed, yet proves it not. But all which the Apoſtle blameth them for impoſing Circumciſion practically upon, are called by him Diſciples, and theſe were principally Infants, *Gen.* 17. 10, 11, 12. Will he ſay, they were not blamed for laying Circumciſion upon Infants? His Inſtance of Infant-Sprinkling is not parallel, becauſe Infant is not a *Genus* for all that we would have baptized.

I proved, ſome Infants had the Name of the Trinity upon them, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. they are [*holy.*] This Holineſs he takes for being Legitimate, but anſwers not what I ſaid againſt it; nor doth he prove all to be holy that are legitimate.

[*Elſe,*] *i. e.* Say ſome, If one be not a Believer; or [*elſe,*] if the Unbeliever were not ſanctified to or by the Believer, then the Children were unclean, not illegitimate: For where there is no Sanctification of one, to or by the other, but both are Infidels or Unbelievers, yet the Children are legitimate, *Heb.* 13. 4. are no Baſtards. The being [*holy*] then muſt be by a Separation unto God.

There is no Good in Sin, but it becometh of humbling and abaſing uſe to the Soul, and ſo accidentally is turned by God to Good to it; which I ſuppoſe Mr. *C.* intendeth, by its being ſanctified to. And this is no new Doctrine, but as old as the Days of *Hezekiah*, 2 *Chron.* 32. 25, 26. and *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 13.

And *if all Infants be in a viſible State of Salvation by the Covenant of Grace*, as Mr. *Grantham* ſaith they are, *p.* 19. *then they have the Name of the Trinity upon them, for the Covenant is a part of his Name*, and ſo they are diſciples; and what hinders

hinders their being baptized? Doth not *Matth.* 28. 19 command it?

He thinks then they ought to partake of the Lord's Table. But are they as capable of Self-Examination, and of that Eating and Drinking, and Spiritual Growth, as they are of being waſhed?

As to my ſecond Argument, *from ſome Infants being viſibly or externally in the Covenant made with* Abraham:

Obj. *He premiſeth, that the Covenant of Grace with* Abraham *was Twenty four Years before Circumciſion: Others under it, as* Salah,— *not ſo circumciſed: And others were, to whom the Covenant of Grace ſeems to have the leaſt extent, as* Iſhmael, Eſau, *Bond-men,*— p. 9.

Then if by Covenant, Mr. P. *means the Covenant of Circumciſion and Infants of Chriſtians, or the Covenant of Grace,* Gen. 12. *he denies the* Minor: *But if Infants be in a viſible State of Salvation, yet he denieth the Conſequence of the* Major, *that they are to be baptized,* p. 10.

Anſ 1. *The Covenant of Grace was made and publiſhed before* Abraham, Gen. 3. 15. and thoſe might have Salvation by it through Chriſt; as *Salah, Arphaxad.*— Then the Church was Domeſtical, but no ſuch clear Declaration of the Subjects, and their Church-ſtate and Privilege, in a Community of many Families for publick Worſhip and Ordinances; no ſuch Sign or Token of the Covenant for Infants, till Circumciſion was granted, *Gen.* 17. And after that Grant to *Abraham*, all good Men that could were obliged to joyn with him, or his Seed, as the only Church in ſuch Order then in the World, as they

they would enjoy ſuch Church-Privileges: Witneſs his Servants which were Profeſſors, *v.* 13. *Gen.* 18. 19. and the Proſelytes, *Exod.* 12. 48, 49. *Iſa.* 56. 3, 6.

2. *I mean that Covenant which Circumciſion was a Token of*, Gen. 17. *v.* 7, to 15.

Indeed, This is the ſame Covenant, for ſubſtance, with that, *Gen.* 12. but in a new Edition; with a Declaration of the ancient Subjects, and an Enlargement of Privileges, as aforeſaid, which expreſly extended to the Infant-Seed, *Gen.* 17. 7, 9, 12 In the ſame Covenant and Breath, *Abraham* himſelf, and alſo his Seed, are commanded to be circumciſed; and that as a Token of the Covenant between God and him, *v.* 9, 10, 11. He and his Seed then were in the ſame Covenant, and Circumciſion was of the ſame uſe to him and others: And that Covenant was not only for Circumciſion and the Land of *Canaan*, but that (at leaſt viſibly) God would be a God to them; and there is a double Aſſurance thereof, *v.* 7, 8. and that clearly was a Covenant of Grace, and is ſtill continuing; for it was to him a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith, *Rom.* 4. 11.

It is then his groſs Miſtake, to think that the Covenant, *Gen.* 12. is one, and that, *Gen.* 17. another diſtinct one. Indeed, the Sign Circumciſion is ceaſed, but the Covenant is not repealed, as to the Subject of it, Infants: This cannot be proved. 'Tis true, ſome did forfeit their viſible, external Intereſt in the Covenant, as *Iſhmael* and *Eſau*; and ſo may Profeſſors of the Goſpel alſo, after duly baptized: But they were ſo in Covenant before, as it had been broken if the Token had been neglected, or not applied, *Gen.* 17. 14.

3. *At*

3. *At laſt, he denieth the Conſequence of the* Major; which is to ſay, *That though ſome Infants be viſibly or externally in the Covenant which God made with* Abraham, *yet by the Will of Chriſt they are not to be baptized.*

I am glad to hear Men of this Perſuaſion confeſs Infants within that Covenant; which indeed they muſt do, or elſe ſhew a Repeal of that Covenant, as to the Subjects of it, which I think they can never prove. But I am ſorry this Man granteth Infants being in that Covenant upon ſuch a corrupt, unſcriptural Principle, *viz.* That all Infants are in a viſible State of Salvation by the Covenant of Grace; he muſt ſay by the Covenant with *Abraham*, if he deny my *Major*, which is grounded upon that; and it will be impoſſible for him to prove all Infants in the World to be the Seed of *Abraham*, that in the very mentioning of it importing a Limitation.

The ground of his Denial is, *p.* 10 upon a great Miſtake, *viz.* that the Covenant of Grace muſt be abſtracted from the Covenant of Circumciſion; whereas that which Circumciſion is annexed to (as I have proved) is the Covenant of Grace, only in a new Edition. Alſo he ſaith, [*That never required the Application of any Ceremony to Infants, as a Pledge of it, either before the Law, or as it is now eſtabliſhed— in the Goſpel.*]

All which is falſe; for Circumciſion was ſuch a Pledge and Token of the Covenant, to be applied to Infants, above Four hundred Years before the Law, *Gal.* 3. 17. and ſo Baptiſm under the Goſpel, *Act.* 2. 38, 39. for that is commanded upon that Ground and Encouragement, that the Promiſe is to them; and that is there to a double

double Subject [*You Repenters, and your Seed,*] and ſo to Infants, and ſo they are commanded to be baptized. All that are under the Ground and Encouragement unto the Duty of being baptized, are obliged to the Duty; and ſome Infants are under that, for the Promiſe is to them.

Gen. 17. ſpeaketh not expreſly of Baptiſm, but it commandeth the Keeping the Covenant by applying the Token of it, which now is not Circumciſion, but Baptiſm; and ſo commandeth that even to Infants, ſeeing they are in the Covenant, as aforeſaid; and there is no Scripture-Warrant to delay the applying that firſt Token of it after Opportunity is offered. If it were limited (as Circumciſion was) to the Eighth Day, it might be delayed till then, but now may be applied before. The Females were uncapable, wanting the part, and yet were deemed circumciſed in the Males, for all *Iſrael* are called the Circumciſion: Which anſwers his *p.* 9, 10, 11, 12.

It ſtill runs there in his Head, that all I ſay is brought forthwith to prove Infant-Baptiſm; whereas I prove other Mediums in order to it. Thus, *p.* 8. I mention *Heb.* 10. 16, 17. only to prove Remiſſion of Sins to be a great Bleſſing of the Covenant: He, *p.* 11. dreams that I muſt mean it of Infants.

So I mention the Second Commandment, as requiring the obſerving Goſpel-Inſtitutions, as Baptiſm after the alteration of the Sign, as of old it required Circumciſion: He fancieth, that I produce it preſently to prove Infant-Baptiſm.

So I, *p.* 41. mention *Matth.* 16. 18. *Rom.* 16. 16, 1 *Cor.* 12. 27. *&c.* to prove that the Church is Chriſt's: He, *p.* 13. conceiteth, that I would hereby

hereby prove Infants viſibly Chriſt's; which I do by other *Mediums*. And here he talketh that Infants may be ſaved who were never baptized, which was not there my Buſineſs.

I am weary of his Impertinencies, but hope that by ſerious reading my Book, any judicious Perſon will have enough there to anſwer him.

Abraham *had an Eccleſiaſtical Seed, even of Infants*, Gen. 17. The Infant-Seed of *Jews* were broken off with their Parents, from external Intereſt in, and Privilege by the Covenant, *Rom.* 11. unleſs he can prove the Infants remained in Covenant ſtill.

The Seed of Believers are viſibly under the Promiſe, the Word of Faith, as the Seed of others are not, and ſo are of the Faith.] I ſee nothing to invalidate what I ſaid thereof.

I ſaid, *Infants Intereſt in the Covenant*, Gen. 17. *is not cut off*.

Inſtead of proving a Repeal, and the Cutting them off, without which, all that he or others ſay is nothing, he replieth,

Obj. 1. *Infants had as good Right to the Covenant of Grace before Circumciſion, and have the ſame Right now*, v. 17, 18.

Anſ. *And what if they had, and have it? That is for me, not againſt me.* But, under favour, Circumciſion was a new Privilege, which Infants had not before, *Gen.* 17.

However, this doth not prove them cut off from any, but the contrary.

Obj. 2. *No Perſon's Right to Circumciſion did ariſe out of the Covenant of Grace, but it did only iſſue from the Command of God*, p. 17.

Anſ.

Anſ. 1. *Here is no Syllable to prove that Infant-Intereſt in the Covenant,* Gen. 17. *is cut off:* Some Infants certainly had it, and ſo muſt ſtill, unleſs there be a Repeal.

2. *The Command is expreſs to all the Seed of* Abraham, *to keep the Covenant by applying the Token:* And Infants are expreſly concerned in that Command, *Gen.* 17. 9, 10, 11, 12. and ſo all Infants within that Covenant are under that Command ſtill, unleſs cut off. 'Tis true, the Sign of Circumciſion is changed, but the Covenant is the ſame, and the Subject of it the ſame: So that whether the Right ariſeth from the Covenant, or from the Command, or both, it matters not; all his Seed, Infants and all in it, by the Command, are to paſs under the Sign: And Circumciſion then being a Token of the Covenant, the Right to it muſt ariſe from the Covenant, although a Command was the Direction for applying the Sign.

Obj. 3. *As Circumciſion did not give* Abraham's *Seed an Intereſt in the Covenant of Grace, ſo the Abrogation did not take that Intereſt from them: He inſtanceth in the delay of it to* Moſes *his Child, the Omiſſion Forty Years in the Wilderneſs:— Infants now have no part in the Covenant of Circumciſion, yet they loſt nothing by it. And then he ſpeaketh of the Typical Covenant of Circumciſion being made void,* p. 17, 18.

Anſ. 1. *Who ſaith that Circumciſion did give them Intereſt in the Covenant of Grace?* Rather a being in that Covenant gave Intereſt in Circumciſion, which was a Token of it. *Moſes* his delay-laying of Circumciſion was his Sin, *Exod.* 4. 24, 25, 26. and had like to have coſt him his Life; and

and *Iſrael*'s Omiſſion of it was their Sin. And is it no Loſs, in Mr. *Grantham*'s Account, to be cut off from External Privileges, unleſs Men be wholly cut off from the Covenant of Grace, and the Salvation thereof? Is it nothing for God to ſay, *Loami?* The Taking away Circumciſion was a Mercy, the Lord giving Baptiſm in lieu of it; but if he had taken away that, and all Church-Privilege, and External Covenant-Intereſt alſo, from Infants, which once they had, it muſt needs be a great Loſs, an unſpeakable Diſadvantage, a ſore Judgment.

2. *Now he declareth that Covenant which Circumciſion did belong to, void, and diſtinguiſhed from the Covenant of Grace, and calleth it a Typical Covenant:* But not one Syllable of Scripture-Evidence for any ſuch thing: We muſt believe it, if he will, becauſe *ipſe dixit.* Here he ſhould have proved a Repeal of that Covenant with *Abraham*; and not having done this, he hath done nothing. I believe that the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. wherein twice God declareth himſelf a God to the Seed of *Abraham*, *v.* 7, 8. the Sign whereof, Circumciſion, *Abraham* received, as a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith, *Rom.* 4. 11. muſt needs be a Covenant of Grace, no Typical Covenant, nor void; for that Righteouſneſs was not of a Covenant only for *Canaan*, but of Grace, for Eternal Life. And that *Abraham* received it as a Sign of one Covenant, and his Seed of another, can never be proved: The contrary is plain, *viz.* that both had it by the ſame Command and Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 9, 10, 11.

But now Mr. *Grantham*, *p.* 19, 20, *&c.* findeth a *Medium* by a new Poſition, *viz.*

Poſit.

Poſit. *That all Infants (as ſuch) are in a Viſible State of Salvation by the Covenant of Grace, and ſo are of the Univerſal Church of God, and cannot be put out of that bleſſed State, till by their voluntary departure from God, by chuſing ſinful Ways, they deſtroy themſelves.*

Anſ. *If this were true, one would think that all Infants, without exception, might be baptized, being ſo in the Covenant of Grace, and of the Church; for then they are made Diſciples, and ſo are expreſly commanded to be baptized,* Matth. 28. 19.

I hope Mr. *Barret* or ſome other will examine this Poſition, I ſhall not now inſiſt long upon it. If never ſo many Infants be in a State of Salvation, or be ſaved, this is not againſt my Principle of Infant-Baptiſm: I would not diminiſh the number of ſaved Ones; however, I think this to be a falſe, unſcriptural Poſition.

Obj. *He telleth us of five Demonſtrations,* p. 20, *to* 24. *but all of them come to one poor Argument from the Covenant of Grace,* Gen. 3. 15. *which he thinketh was made with all Mankind, with the whole World.*

Anſ. 1. *That all Mankind, or the whole World, is this Seed of the Woman with whom the Covenant of Grace was made, is altogether without Proof;* and ſo all his Demonſtrations are wholly groundleſs. Let him but form an Argument from *Gen.* 3. 15. that is univerſal, and any may ſee it will have a *Non ſequitur.*

The utmoſt here ſaid is, that a Seed of the Woman, or ſome of her Seed, ſhould be ſaved; but it is not ſaid, All the Woman's Seed, as ſuch, ſhould be ſaved. His Poſition ſhould be his Concluſion of all his Demonſtrations *viz. That all Infants (as ſuch) are in a viſible State of Salvation by*

by the Covenant of Grace. But ſuch a Concluſion hath no Footing in, no Countenance from this Text, not ſo much as by Conſequence. I think I have better than this for Infant-Baptiſm; and I might ſay as well, that all their Seed have the Spirit poured out upon them, and the Word in their Mouth, *Iſa.* 44. 3. and 59. 21.

The truth is, *Gen.* 3. 15. cometh in as a Threatning of Puniſhment or Severity againſt the Serpent, (as any obſerving Eye may ſee,) yet implying a Promiſe of Mercy, attainable by ſome ſinning Men, through Chriſt, a Seed of the Woman. Until *Adam* did take hold of that Promiſe by Faith in that Seed, Chriſt, he remained out of Covenant, as others, *Epheſ.* 2. 8, 12. When *Adam* was actually and perſonally admitted into the Covenant of Grace, yet it was not as a common, publick Perſon, and Head of that Covenant, repreſenting all his Seed, as he was before his Fall a Head of the Covenant of Nature; for then *Adam*'s After-Sins againſt the Covenant would have been imputed to all his Seed, as his former were, againſt the Covenant of Works, *Rom.* 5. 12, *&c. v.* 20.—

Now every individual Man was perſonally to be in Covenant; and if he derived external Privilege, it was only to his next or immediate Seed.

Hence, if *Adam*'s Infant-Seed might have outward Privilege by being his Poſterity, (or any before *Abraham*,) yet if any of them after rejected the Covenant, (as *Cain* did,) they caſt themſelves out of that external Privilege, and their Infant-Seed with them. So in after Generations, *Hagar*, and *Iſhmael* her Seed were caſt out, and *Eſau* and

his, the *Iſraelites* and theirs, *Rom.* 11. and thoſe were Strangers to the Covenants, *Epheſ.* 2. 12. See alſo *Pſal.* 37. 28.

I know not that *Adam* and *Eve* (two Perſons) made a Church: Let Mr. *Grantham* prove it. But that Promiſe laid a Foundation for the Erecting a Viſible Church afterward.

If *Adam*'s Family was the Church, (as you ſay,) and the whole World, or all Mankind that then was (and ſo his Infant-Seed) were Members of it, yet *Cain* and his Seed were ſoon rejected; notwithſtanding which, many Perſons believing in that Seed, Chriſt, were ſo ſaved in after Generations, through that Promiſe. But that all Infants of rejected *Cain*, *Iſhmael*, or *Eſau* were in a viſible State of Salvation, and of the Viſible Church, or that all dying in Infancy are certainly ſaved, appeareth not, *Gen.* 3. 15. Mr. *Grantham* aſſerting, it is Preſumption without Proof.

2. *That* Gen. 3. 15. *mentioneth a Seed of the Serpent, which is part of the World,* as well as the Seed of the Woman, which the Covenant of Grace extendeth to; and hence this Text which he alledgeth is excluſive of ſome, and ſo confuteth his Demonſtration. For if there be in it another oppoſite Seed, then all Mankind, or the whole World, cannot be compriſed in the Seed of the Woman, who are under this Promiſe. Will he ſay, the Seed of the Serpent are viſibly in a State of Salvation, by the Covenant of Grace: Or that they are no part of the World?

3. *Only thoſe are this Seed of the Woman, under this Covenant or Promiſe, who have Enmity againſt the Serpent, and ſuch Power over him, as to bruiſe his Head: And this is excluſive of others.*

For

For that is expreſly the Qualification of the Seed of the Woman here intended: Yea, the whole of the Promiſe which here extendeth unto any of Mankind is, *Gen.* 3. 15. *I will put Enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed; it ſhall bruiſe thy Head*; the following Words concern the Serpent, *viz. his bruiſing his Heel.* So then, none elſe are this Seed of the Woman, or viſibly in a State of Salvation, by this Covenant, but ſuch in whom is found that Enmity againſt the Serpent, ſo as to conflict with, and prevail againſt him. Therefore this [*Seed of the Woman*] can be only Chriſt, 1 *Joh.* 3. 8. *Heb.* 2. 14, 15. and ſuch as believe in him; for, 1 *Joh.* 5. 4. *This is the Victory,— even our Faith.* Hence the whole World cannot be here intended.

If whole Mankind, yea, all Infants were that Seed of the Woman, then all Infants have Enmity againſt the Serpent, and then they are capable of, yea have Love to God, and Faith in him, and ſo may be baptized.

It is the Covenant which I called the great Charter of Heaven, *viz.* of the God of Heaven: And as others, by denying Infants Intereſt therein, do take from it, ſo let him take heed of adding to it.

A POSTSCRIPT.

THE foregoing Answer to Mr. *Grantham* should have been published soon after its Date, 1687. with Mr. *Firmin's*, if his had not been out before he expected; and it is at the desire of some Friends, that now it cometh forth.

He intimateth, p. 9. *that* Salah, Heber, &c. *lived after* Gen. 17. *and were not circumcised, nor had Obligation to Circumcision.*

But *this is more than he knows*, seeing so little is revealed to us of the way of their Worship in that Day. And it seemeth to be false, because *Abraham* then was declared *the Father of many Nations*, v. 5. And so Believers of other Nations were then his Seed, and obliged, if some lawful Impediment hindred not.

However, this is certain, that believing Gentiles in Gospel-Times are graffed into, or interested in the same Covenant that was made with Abraham, Gen. 17. *and his Seed*; the same Olive which the *Jews* were broken off from, *Rom.* 11. 11, to 27. And as of old they were circumcised, not merely by virtue of a Command, but as a Token of the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 14. hence all under that Covenant that could, were to submit to it, and that as a Mark of Distinction; for they were distinguished from others by Circumcision: Even so it is now as to Baptism.

And

And whereas Mr. *Grantham denieth that the Covenant*, Gen. 17. *is a Gospel-Covenant, or a Covenant of Grace,*

This *is his gross Errour; for the Apostle proveth Justification in Gospel-Times to be by Grace from this Covenant with* Abraham, Rom. 4. 1,2,3,4,16,17.

This is the very Ground which his Argument is built upon, *viz. That we under the Gospel are justified in the same way that* Abraham *was, and therefore by Grace:* By the Promise, and not by the Law. If this could be denied, all his Arguing were vain and false.

Now *that Covenant with* Abraham, Gen. 17. *which Circumcision did belong to, is that which his Argument is bottomed upon,* as is evident, *Rom.* 4. 16. *Therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace.*— How doth he prove that? *V.* 17. *As it is written, I have made thee a Father of many Nations*— Now it is very observable, that this is quoted out of *Gen.*17.4,5. and it is no where else in foregoing Editions of the Covenant: *It is not found in* Gen. 12. *nor in* Gen. 15. *therefore that,* Gen. 17. *was a Gospel-Covenant, and not ceased.*

Doth Mr. *Grantham* think that the Apostle would seek to prove our Justification by an abrogated Covenant, and a legal one too, as he would have this be?

I might prove it a *Gospel-Covenant from his calling Circumcision a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith,* Rom. 4. 11. and there is no Syllable in the Institution, declaring it to be of one Use to *Abraham,* and of another to other Persons.

Also, *From his setting this Promise to* Abraham, *in opposition to the Law,* Rom. 4. 13, 14. it is contradistinguished from that, as elsewhere, *Gal.* 3. 17.

This

This evidenceth it to be a Covenant of Grace, and ſtill in force; and if for Juſtification, then alſo for External Privileges to the Subjects of it.

And *once more from* Gen. 17. 7,8. *where twice he promiſeth to be* [their God] *which is the great Bleſſing of the new Covenant*, Heb 8. 10.

What is objected *to make it a legal Covenant, as that Circumciſion made Men Debtors to the whole Law, &c. is vain.*

For either it ſpeaketh of it in the Senſe of the Falſe Prophets, who urge Circumciſion— for Juſtification and Salvation: And thus if Men ſhould urge any Duty, even Baptiſm, upon ſuch a legal Ground, it would make them Debtors to the whole Law. *Or it imports, that neither Circumciſion, nor any Works of the Law, do profit, unleſs all be performed*; for the Law promiſed nothing but upon perfect Obedience, *Gal.* 3. 10. *Rom.* 10. 5.

As to *Gen.* 3. 15. It maketh no mention of Infants, much leſs of all of them. What Share they have in a Promiſe, muſt be deduced from other Texts, not from this. Will he ſay, that [*Seed*] and [*Infants*,] or [*all Infants*,] are ſynonymous? Here no more is ſaid of all Infants being the Seed of the Woman, than of ſome of them being the Seed of the Serpent.

I ſhall only add, that if Mr. *Grantham* ſhould reply ſo as I be convinced that the ſubſtance of what I have here written be not Truth, then I intend a Retractation: But if I be ſilent, it may be concluded that I do not account him worth the Anſwering.

A Catalogue

A Catalogue of Books, Printed for, and are to be Sold by Edward Giles, *Bookseller in* Norwich, *near the* Market-Place.

SEveral Diſcourſes concerning Actual Providence.

A Word in Seaſon.

Defenſive Armour againſt four of *Satan*'s moſt fiery Darts.

Sermons upon the whole 1ſt and 2d Chapter of *Canticles*.

Thirteen Sermons upon ſeveral uſeful Subjects. All publiſhed by *John Collings*. D. D. of *Norwich*.

The Way of the Spirit in bringing Souls to Chriſt.

The Glory of Chriſt ſet forth, with the Neceſſity of Faith: In ſeveral Sermons. Both by Mr. *Thomas Allen*, late Paſtor of a Church at *Norwich*.

Enoch's Walk with God and Chriſt, a Chriſtian's Gain. By Mr. *Timothy Armitage*, late Miniſter at *Norwich*.

A Diſcourſe of the Preciouſneſs of Chriſt, and of the Preciouſneſs of Faith.

Precious Promiſes the Portion of Overcomers.

Sermons on five ſeveral uſeful Subjects. All by Mr. *John Longher*, Miniſter in *Norfolk*.

The Saint's *Ebenezer*. By Mr. *Francis Engliſh*, late Miniſter in *Norwich*.

Directions to ſpell *Engliſh* right.

The Hiſtory of the *Proteſtant Reformation*, as it was begun by *Luther*.

The dead Saints ſpeaking: Being a Sermon preached upon the Death of Mr. *Newcomb*, of *Deadham* in *Eſſex*.

The *Engliſh Presbyterian*.

The Miracles of Chriſt.

The ordinary Matter of Prayer, drawn into Queſtions and Anſwers.

Two Treatiſes: The firſt, Of Rejoycing in the Lord Jeſus in all Caſes and Conditions. The ſecond, Of a Chriſtian's Hope in Heaven, and Freedom from Condemnation by Chriſt. Both by Mr. *Robert Aſly* late Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt in *Norwich*.

Obedience to Magiſtrates: Recommended in a Sermon preached *September* the 9th, 1683. being the Thankſgiving-Day for His Majeſty's Deliverance. By *Jonathan Clapham*, Rector of *Wramplingham* in *Norfolk*.

A Preſent

A Preſent for Youth, and an Example for the Aged: Two Diſcourſes; one, Of Spiritual Bleſſings; the other, That God hath an high Account of the leaſt Grace in the Saints. By Mr. *John Cromwell*, late Paſtor of a Church of Chriſt in *Norwich*.

Infant-Baptiſm of Chriſt's Appointment. By Mr. *Samuel Petto*, Miniſter of the Goſpel in *Sudbury* in *Suffolk*.

Of the Converſion of Sinners to God, in Chriſt; the Neceſſity, Nature, Means and Signs of it: With a Concluding Speech to the Unconverted.

An Anſwer to Mr. *Thomas Grantham*'s Book, called A Dialogue between the Baptiſt and Presbyterian. Both by *Martin Finch*, Paſtor of a Church of Chriſt in *Norwich*.

Sincerity: *Or*, The Upright Man's Walk to Heaven: Delivered in ſeveral Sermons in the Pariſh-Church of St. *Michael*, in *Long-ſtratten*, in *Norfolk*. By *James Oldfield*, late Miniſter there.

Alexipharmacon Spirituale: Being a Defenſative againſt the Poiſon and Sting of Death: *Or*, The Great Expedient how to make the Bed of the Grave ſo eaſie, that we may lie down in Peace, and take our Reſt. By *Samuel Snowden*, Miniſter of the Goſpel at *Newton* in *Norfolk*.

Chriſt ſet forth: In ſeveral Sermons upon the 17th Chapter to the *Hebrews*. By Mr. *Robert Otte*, late Paſtor to a Congregation in *Bucklis* in *Suffolk*.

Sacramental Diſcourſes on ſeveral ſelect Subjects. To which is added, A Diſcourſe of the Life of Faith. By *Chriſtopher Amarett*, Miniſter of the Goſpel in *Norfolk*.

A Diſcovery of Audacious Inſolence againſt the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, vented in a malicious Pamphlet, publiſhed againſt the Presbyterians, by *Thomas Grantham*: Together with a Poem thereon. And a Poſtſcript, wherein ſome of the Citizens of *Norwich* are more particularly concerned and cautioned.

F I N I S.